

SO. CAL. EQUAL ACCESS GROUP  
Jason J. Kim (SBN 190246)  
Jason Yoon (SBN 306137)  
101 S. Western Ave., Second Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90004  
Telephone: (213) 252-8008  
Facsimile: (213) 252-8009  
scalequalaccess@yahoo.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff  
NELSON CHILIN

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

NELSON CHILIN,  
Plaintiff,  
vs.

PACNET INVESTMENTS, INC.; and  
DOES 1 to 10,  
Defendants.

**Case No.:**

COMPLAINT FOR INJUNCTIVE  
RELIEF AND DAMAGES FOR DENIAL  
OF CIVIL RIGHTS OF A DISABLED  
PERSON IN VIOLATIONS OF

1. AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES  
ACT, 42 U.S.C. §12131 et seq.;

2. CALIFORNIA'S UNRUH CIVIL  
RIGHTS ACT;

3. CALIFORNIA'S DISABLED  
PERSONS ACT;

4. CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY  
CODE;

5. NEGLIGENCE

Plaintiff NELSON CHILIN ("Plaintiff") complains of Defendants PACNET  
INVESTMENTS, INC.; and DOES 1 to 10 ("Defendants") and alleges as follows:

**PARTIES**

1. Plaintiff is a California resident with a physical disability. Plaintiff is a  
paraplegic due to spinal cord injury and is substantially limited in his ability to walk.  
Plaintiff requires the use of a wheelchair at all times when traveling in public.



1           9.     Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 USC §1391(b). The real  
2 property which is the subject of this action is located in this district, Eastern Division,  
3 California, and that all actions complained of herein take place in this district.

4                               **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS**

5           10.    In or about March of 2023, Plaintiff went to the Business.

6           11.    The Business is a discount store business establishment, open to the public,  
7 and is a place of public accommodation that affects commerce through its operation.  
8 Defendants provide parking spaces for customers.

9           12.    While attempting to enter the Business during each visit, Plaintiff personally  
10 encountered a number of barriers that interfered with his ability to use and enjoy the  
11 goods, services, privileges, and accommodations offered at the Business.

12          13.    To the extent of Plaintiff's personal knowledge, the barriers at the Business  
13 included, but were not limited to, the following:

- 14               a.     Defendants failed to comply with the federal and state standards for  
15                       the parking space designated for persons with disabilities. Defendants  
16                       failed to provide the parking space identification sign with the  
17                       International Symbol of Accessibility.
- 18               b.     Defendants failed to comply with the federal and state standards for  
19                       the parking space designated for persons with disabilities. Defendants  
20                       failed to post required signage such as "Van Accessible," "Minimum  
21                       Fine \$250" and "Unauthorized Parking."
- 22               c.     Defendants failed to comply with the federal and state standards for  
23                       the parking space designated for persons with disabilities. Defendants  
24                       failed paint the "NO PARKING" marking upon the ground of the van  
25                       accessible aisle.
- 26               d.     Defendants failed to maintain the parking space designated for  
27                       persons with disabilities to comply with the federal and state  
28

standards. Defendants failed to maintain the paint on the ground as required.

14. Based on the violations, Plaintiff alleges, on information and belief, that there are additional barriers to accessibility at the Business after further site inspection. Plaintiff seeks to have all barriers related to his disability remedied. *See Doran v. 7-Eleven, Inc.* 524 F.3d 1034 (9<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2008).

15. In addition, Plaintiff alleges, on information and belief, that Defendants knew that particular barriers render the Business inaccessible, violate state and federal law, and interfere with access for the physically disabled.

16. At all relevant times, Defendants had and still have control and dominion over the conditions at this location and had and still have the financial resources to remove these barriers without much difficulty or expenses to make the Business accessible to the physically disabled in compliance with ADDAG and Title 24 regulations. Defendants have not removed such barriers and have not modified the Business to conform to accessibility regulations.

### **FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION**

#### **VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990**

17. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each of the allegations in all prior paragraphs in this complaint.

18. Under the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (“ADA”), no individual shall be discriminated against on the basis of disability in the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of any place of public accommodation by any person who owns, leases, or leases to, or operates a place of public accommodation. *See* 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a).

19. Discrimination, *inter alia*, includes:

- a. A failure to make reasonable modification in policies, practices, or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford such goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations

1 to individuals with disabilities, unless the entity can demonstrate that  
2 making such modifications would fundamentally alter the nature of  
3 such goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or  
4 accommodations. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).

5 b. A failure to take such steps as may be necessary to ensure that no  
6 individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or  
7 otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the  
8 absence of auxiliary aids and services, unless the entity can  
9 demonstrate that taking such steps would fundamentally alter the  
10 nature of the good, service, facility, privilege, advantage, or  
11 accommodation being offered or would result in an undue burden. 42  
12 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iii).

13 c. A failure to remove architectural barriers, and communication barriers  
14 that are structural in nature, in existing facilities, and transportation  
15 barriers in existing vehicles and rail passenger cars used by an  
16 establishment for transporting individuals (not including barriers that  
17 can only be removed through the retrofitting of vehicles or rail  
18 passenger cars by the installation of a hydraulic or other lift), where  
19 such removal is readily achievable. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv).

20 d. A failure to make alterations in such a manner that, to the maximum  
21 extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are readily  
22 accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities, including  
23 individuals who use wheelchairs or to ensure that, to the maximum  
24 extent feasible, the path of travel to the altered area and the  
25 bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving the altered  
26 area, are readily accessible to and usable by individuals with  
27 disabilities where such alterations to the path or travel or the  
28 bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving the altered

1 area are not disproportionate to the overall alterations in terms of cost  
2 and scope. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2).

3 20. Where parking spaces are provided, accessible parking spaces shall be  
4 provided. 1991 ADA Standards § 4.1.2(5); 2010 ADA Standards § 208. One in every  
5 eight accessible spaces, but not less than one, shall be served by an access aisle 96 in  
6 (2440 mm) wide minimum and shall be designated “van accessible.” 1991 ADA  
7 Standards § 4.1.2(5)(b). For every six or fraction of six parking spaces, at least one shall  
8 be van parking space. 2010 ADA Standards § 208.2.4.

9 21. Under the ADA, the method and color of marking are to be addressed by  
10 State or local laws or regulations. See 36 C.F.R., Part 1191. Under the California  
11 Building Code (“CBC”), the parking space identification signs shall include the  
12 International Symbol of Accessibility. Parking identification signs shall be reflectorized  
13 with a minimum area of 70 square inches. Additional language or an additional sign  
14 below the International Symbol of Accessibility shall state “Minimum Fine \$250.” A  
15 parking space identification sign shall be permanently posted immediately adjacent and  
16 visible from each parking space, shall be located with its centerline a maximum of 12  
17 inches from the centerline of the parking space and may be posted on a wall at the  
18 interior end of the parking space. See CBC § 11B-502.6, et seq.

19 22. Moreover, an additional sign shall be posted either in a conspicuous place at  
20 each entrance to an off-street parking facility or immediately adjacent to on-site  
21 accessible parking and visible from each parking space. The additional sign shall not be  
22 less than 17 inches wide by 22 inches high. The additional sign shall clearly state in  
23 letters with a minimum height of 1 inch the following: “Unauthorized vehicles parked in  
24 designated accessible spaces not displaying distinguishing placards or special license  
25 plates issued for persons with disabilities will be towed always at the owner’s expense...”  
26 See CBC § 11B-502.8, et seq.

27 23. Here, Defendants failed to provide the parking space identification sign with  
28 the International Symbol of Accessibility. In addition, Defendants failed to provide the

1 signs stating “Minimum Fine \$250” and “Van Accessible.” Moreover, Defendants failed  
2 to provide the additional sign with the specific languages stating “Unauthorized vehicles  
3 parked in designated accessible spaces not displaying distinguishing placards or special  
4 license plates issued for persons with disabilities will be towed always at the owner’s  
5 expense...”

6 24. For the parking spaces, access aisles shall be marked with a blue painted  
7 borderline around their perimeter. The area within the blue borderlines shall be marked  
8 with hatched lines a maximum of 36 inches (914 mm) on center in a color contrasting  
9 with that of the aisle surface, preferably blue or white. The words "NO PARKING" shall  
10 be painted on the surface within each access aisle in white letters a minimum of 12 inches  
11 (305 mm) in height and located to be visible from the adjacent vehicular way. CBC §  
12 11B-502.3.3.

13 25. Here, Defendants failed to provide a proper access aisle as there were no  
14 “NO PARKING” marking on the parking surface. The paint of the blue hatched lines  
15 indicating the presence of the van accessible aisle was also faded.

16 26. A public accommodation shall maintain in operable working condition those  
17 features of facilities and equipment that are required to be readily accessible to and usable  
18 by persons with disabilities by the Act or this part. 28 C.F.R. 35.211(a).

19 27. By failing to maintain the facility to be readily accessible and usable by  
20 Plaintiff, Defendants are in violation of Plaintiff’s rights under the ADA and its related  
21 regulations.

22 28. The Business has denied and continues to deny full and equal access to  
23 Plaintiff and to other people with disabilities. Plaintiff has been and will continue to be  
24 discriminated against due to the lack of accessible facilities, and therefore, seeks  
25 injunctive relief to alter facilities to make such facilities readily accessible to and usable  
26 by individuals with disabilities.

27 //

28 //



**SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION**

**VIOLATION OF THE UNRUH CIVIL RIGHTS ACT**

29. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each of the allegations in all prior paragraphs in this complaint.

30. California Civil Code § 51 states, “All persons within the jurisdiction of this state are free and equal, and no matter what their sex, race, color, religion, ancestry, national origin, disability, medical condition, genetic information, marital status, sexual orientation, citizenship, primary language, or immigration status are entitled to the full and equal accommodations, advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all business establishments of every kind whatsoever.”

31. California Civil Code § 52 states, “Whoever denies, aids or incites a denial, or make any discrimination or distinction contrary to Section 51, 51.5, or 51.6, is liable for each and every offense for the actual damages, and any amount that may be determined by a jury, or a court sitting without a jury, up to a maximum of three times the amount of actual damage but in no case less than four thousand dollars (\$4,000) and any attorney’s fees that may be determined by the court in addition thereto, suffered by any person denied the rights provided in Section 51, 51.5, or 51.6.

32. California Civil Code § 51(f) specifies, “a violation of the right of any individual under federal Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-336) shall also constitute a violation of this section.”

33. The actions and omissions of Defendants alleged herein constitute a denial of full and equal accommodation, advantages, facilities, privileges, or services by physically disabled persons within the meaning of California Civil Code §§ 51 and 52. Defendants have discriminated against Plaintiff in violation of California Civil Code §§ 51 and 52.

34. The violations of the Unruh Civil Rights Act caused Plaintiff to experience difficulty, discomfort, or embarrassment. The Defendants are also liable for statutory damages as specified in California Civil Code §55.56(a)-(c).



**THIRD CAUSE OF ACTION**

**VIOLATION OF CALIFORNIA DISABLED PERSONS ACT**

35. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each of the allegations in all prior paragraphs in this complaint.

36. California Civil Code § 54.1(a) states, “Individuals with disabilities shall be entitled to full and equal access, as other members of the general public, to accommodations, advantages, facilities, medical facilities, including hospitals, clinics, and physicians’ offices, and privileges of all common carriers, airplanes, motor vehicles, railroad trains, motorbuses, streetcars, boats, or any other public conveyances or modes of transportation (whether private, public, franchised, licensed, contracted, or otherwise provided), telephone facilities, adoption agencies, private schools, hotels, loading places, places of public accommodations, amusement, or resort, and other places in which the general public is invited, subject only to the conditions and limitations established by law, or state or federal regulation, and applicable alike to all persons.

37. California Civil Code § 54.3(a) states, “Any person or persons, firm or corporation who denies or interferes with admittance to or enjoyment of public facilities as specified in Sections 54 and 54.1 or otherwise interferes with the rights of an individual with a disability under Sections 54, 54.1 and 54.2 is liable for each offense for the actual damages, and any amount as may be determined by a jury, or a court sitting without a jury, up to a maximum of three times the amount of actual damages but in no case less than one thousand dollars (\$1,000) and any attorney’s fees that may be determined by the court in addition thereto, suffered by any person denied the rights provided in Section 54, 54.1, and 54.2.

38. California Civil Code § 54(d) specifies, “a violation of the right of an individual under Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (Public Law 101-336) also constitute a violation of this section, and nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the access of any person in violation of that act.

39. The actions and omissions of Defendants alleged herein constitute a denial of full and equal accommodation, advantages, and facilities by physically disabled persons within the meaning of California Civil Code § 54. Defendants have discriminated against Plaintiff in violation of California Civil Code § 54.

40. The violations of the California Disabled Persons Act caused Plaintiff to experience difficulty, discomfort, and embarrassment. The Defendants are also liable for statutory damages as specified in California Civil Code §55.56(a)-(c).

#### **FOURTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

##### **CALIFORNIA HEALTH & SAFETY CODE § 19955, et seq.**

41. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each of the allegations in all prior paragraphs in this complaint.

42. Plaintiff and other similar physically disabled persons who require the use of a wheelchair are unable to use public facilities on a “full and equal” basis unless each such facility is in compliance with the provisions of California Health & Safety Code § 19955 et seq. Plaintiff is a member of the public whose rights are protected by the provisions of California Health & Safety Code § 19955 et seq.

43. The purpose of California Health & Safety Code § 1995 et seq. is to ensure that public accommodations or facilities constructed in this state with private funds adhere to the provisions of Chapter 7 (commencing with Section 4450) of Division 5 of Title 1 of the Government Code. The code relating to such public accommodations also require that “when sanitary facilities are made available for the public, clients, or employees in these stations, centers, or buildings, they shall be made available for persons with disabilities.

44. Title II of the ADA holds as a “general rule” that no individual shall be discriminated against on the basis of disability in the full and equal enjoyment of goods (or use), services, facilities, privileges, and accommodations offered by any person who owns, operates, or leases a place of public accommodation. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a). Further, each and every violation of the ADA also constitutes a separate and distinct

1 violation of California Civil Code §§ 54(c) and 54.1(d), thus independently justifying an  
2 award of damages and injunctive relief pursuant to California law, including but not  
3 limited to Civil Code § 54.3 and Business and Professions Code § 17200, et seq.

4 **FIFTH CAUSE OF ACTION**

5 **NEGLIGENCE**

6 45. Plaintiff incorporates by reference each of the allegations in all prior  
7 paragraphs in this complaint.

8 46. Defendants have a general duty and a duty under the ADA, Unruh Civil  
9 Rights Act and California Disabled Persons Act to provide safe and accessible facilities  
10 to the Plaintiff.

11 47. Defendants breached their duty of care by violating the provisions of ADA,  
12 Unruh Civil Rights Act and California Disabled Persons Act.

13 48. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' negligent conduct, Plaintiff  
14 has suffered damages.

15 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

16 WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully prays for relief and judgment against  
17 Defendants as follows:

18 1. For preliminary and permanent injunction directing Defendants to comply  
19 with the Americans with Disability Act and the Unruh Civil Rights Act;

20 2. Award of all appropriate damages, including but not limited to statutory  
21 damages, general damages and treble damages in amounts, according to proof;

22 3. Award of all reasonable restitution for Defendants' unfair competition  
23 practices;

24 4. Reasonable attorney's fees, litigation expenses, and costs of suit in this  
25 action;

26 5. Prejudgment interest pursuant to California Civil Code § 3291; and

27 6. Such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

28 //

**DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY**

Pursuant to Rule 38(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Plaintiff hereby demands a trial by jury on all issues so triable.

Dated: June 9, 2023

SO. CAL. EQUAL ACCESS GROUP

By: /s/ Jason J. Kim  
Jason J. Kim, Esq.  
Attorneys for Plaintiff